

ORIGINAL
(Red)

**MEETING SUMMARY
SAND, GRAVEL AND STONE SITE
ELKTON, CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
SEPTEMBER 5, 1985**

A public meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. on September 5, 1985, at Elkton High School, in Elkton, Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with interested parties the results of the remedial investigation (RI) and the feasibility study (FS) conducted by the EPA at the Sand, Gravel and Stone Site and to request comments from the public concerning the FS and the EPA's preferred alternative.

There were approximately 30 individuals in the audience including representatives from the local radio station and newspaper, the Cecil County Sheriff's Department, various state agencies, contractors who have been involved in site work, the EPA, some potentially responsible parties (PRP), and interested citizens.

Boyd Grove of the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene opened the meeting by introducing himself and explaining the purpose of the meeting. He stated that any verbal or written questions after the meeting could be communicated to him at his office in Baltimore. Mr. Grove then introduced Ann Cardinal, who is Community Relations Coordinator for the EPA Region III office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Ms. Cardinal explained the concept of the RI and FS and briefly reviewed the fact sheets that were made available to everyone at the meeting. She then explained that after the public meeting, interested parties had until September 20 to comment on the FS before the EPA issued its Record of Decision (ROD), which states the preferred alternative for cleanup of the Sand, Gravel and Stone Site. She went on to explain that after the ROD is issued, the EPA begins a remedial design phase, which studies the methods of implementing the preferred alternative.

Ms. Cardinal then turned the meeting over to Roy Schrock, who is the Region III EPA project manager for the site. Mr. Schrock explained the roles played by the various contractors and agencies working with the EPA on this project, including NUS, AEPCO, and the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

Mr. Schrock's presentation was divided into two parts corresponding to the RI and the FS reports. First he explained the history of the EPA's investigation, the RI, and the current extent of the EPA's knowledge about the site. This included a description of the contaminants found in the surface waters, the soils, and the shallow groundwater aquifer on site. He emphasized the point that the RI thus far had not investigated the deeper aquifers for contamination, and that this investigation, referred to as the Phase II RI, would need to be conducted at a later time.

He then explained that contamination was found in only one offsite well and that the contaminant, which is not considered by the EPA to be a serious health threat, was found at barely detectable levels (5 to 7 parts per billion). Though the

ORIGINAL
(Red)

situation does not constitute a health threat, it does indicate that the contamination has moved off site.

Prior to beginning the second part of his presentation concerning the remedial alternatives, Mr. Schrock entertained questions from the audience. These questions were generally requests for clarifications or additional explanations of further proposed studies (Phase II) and the nature, quantities, and movement of contaminants on the site. A summary of issues and responses is included at the end of this report.

During the second part of Mr. Schrock's presentation, he briefly described each of the 7 alternative remedial actions. He then introduced the preferred alternative, along with a more detailed explanation and requested comments and questions from the audience.

The comments and questions generally pertained to what had been said at the meeting since no one in the audience had time to review the fact sheets prior to that evening. Most of the questions were requests for further information or clarification of topics discussed previously during the meeting.

Attached is a summary of issues and questions that were raised during the meeting and the responses given by the EPA.

ORIGINAL
(Red)

**A SUMMARY OF
CITIZEN AND INTERESTED-PARTY COMMENTS
AND CONCERNS AND U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY RESPONSES**

**SAND, GRAVEL AND STONE SITE
PUBLIC MEETING**

**ELKTON, CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
SEPTEMBER 5, 1985**

Issue: Interested parties were curious as to when the Phase II RI would be completed and how the results would affect the results of the Phase I FS.

Response: Phase II will begin in October and will require 3 to 6 months for data collection. After the data are analyzed, another feasibility study will be prepared to deal with the entire site rather than just that part of the site studied under the Phase I RI. The results of the current FS should not be affected by further findings from the Phase II RI, except in terms of cost increases resulting from the potential need to treat greater quantities of groundwater and dispose of more materials and soil at offsite locations.

Issue: A number of questions pertained to the nature and movement of the contaminants found on site. Explanations were requested for some of the more technical terms used during the presentation. One individual wanted to know if there were any PCBs or radioactive materials found on site. Individuals were also concerned about what was in the buried drums.

Response: A description of the difference between volatile and semivolatile chemicals was given. While many of the chemicals found on the site have been identified, the contents of the buried drums and containers have not been sampled. It is assumed that they contain many of the chemicals identified on the site thus far, and possibly additional ones. No radioactive materials or PCBs have been found on the site.

Groundwater is moving at a rate of about 10 feet/year, which means it will be a long time before health threatening contamination reaches any offsite wells. Despite the fact that nonhealth-threatening contamination was found in one offsite well, the chances of a "slug" of contamination reaching an offsite well are slight. Monitoring wells would be able to detect any movement of this nature to offsite locations.

1002

Issue: A number of individuals requested clarification or further information on the alternatives resulting from the FS. Questions pertained specifically to the nature of the groundwater treatment system, schedule for cleanup, and amount of time required to flush contaminants from the soil.

Response: If the preferred alternative is chosen, it will be 9 months to a year before work begins. The buried drums would be disposed at an approved, offsite facility. The groundwater treatment system would consist of a number of chemical process steps designed to remove chemical contaminants at various stages of the process, as determined by individual contaminant characteristics. Redundancy is built into the system so that if one part of the system fails, that function can be performed by a backup unit. (A technical explanation of each part of the process was provided in response to the question.)

It was estimated that 30 to 70 years would be required to flush contaminants from the soil.

Issue: Interested parties were concerned about the size and use of an onsite landfill and use of the land after closure of the landfill.

Response: If an alternative requiring a landfill were chosen, the landfill would be designed according to the needs of the site and would be approximately 150 feet by 150 feet. If the EPA constructed the landfill with Superfund money, it would be used only for disposal of onsite wastes. However, if a private consortium built it without the use of Superfund money, and the EPA approved it, the landfill could potentially be used for commercial disposal of offsite wastes.

Issue: Citizens were interested in knowing what could be done with the land after the cleanup had been completed.

Response: No final cleanup for the site has yet been proposed. The land is privately owned, and neither the EPA nor the state would assume ownership as a result of cleanup. If a landfill is constructed on the site, deed restrictions would be enacted to control future land use and the integrity of the landfill. If onsite soil treatment is required (as opposed to offsite disposal), necessary personnel would be granted access rights for the required amount of time. At the completion of the cleanup, the land would still belong to the owner.

Issue: One individual wanted to know if choosing a lesser remedial alternative or concentrating on removal of one group of chemicals would result in reducing the threat of contamination to an acceptable level.

Response: Standards for site cleanup have not yet been put on paper, although the EPA would like to meet drinking water standards or reduce contaminants so that they are below the 10^{-6} cancer risk level. The EPA does not believe it is feasible to treat one set of chemicals and leave another in the ground just to be able to meet a standard risk level.

ORIGINAL
(Red)

Issue: It was mentioned previously in the meeting that children have played on the site. Citizens were concerned about site security and continued access by these children.

Response: One of the EPA's initial actions in May 1984 was to install a snow fence with gates. The fence did not prove to be a successful barrier to children. A 6-foot chain-link fence has not been installed because it would require building an access road, in effect increasing access to the area. To intruders, the trees and the wooded area appear to act as a barrier around the contaminated groundwater seep areas. There are warning signs posted outside the site.

Issue: Citizens were interested in whether the responsible parties were known and by what method the EPA identifies these parties.

Response: To date the EPA has identified approximately 29 potentially responsible parties (PRP), some of which are local firms. No legal actions have been taken against any of these firms. The identity of PRPs comes from historical records and discussions with the property owner, as well as other involved parties.

00904